

Serial No.: 09/815,603  
Examiner: Christopher Grey

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 remain in this application with claims 1, 10 and 18 being independent claims.

In the outstanding office action, independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamberton et al. (US 6,754,220) in view of Li et al. (US 5,473,599). In support of this rejection, it was set forth that "Lamberton makes reference to the use of HSRP and VRRP as the types of protocol being applied to the LAN (as disclosed in Col 3 lines 52 - Col 4 lines 25)". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Although Lamberton does make reference to each of HSRP and VRRP, the reference to each on in different systems. HSRP is referenced with respect to the LAN disclosed in FIG. 1 of Lamberton, while the VRRP is referenced with respect to the LAN disclosed in FIG. 3 of Lamberton. There is no teaching or suggestion in Lamberton that these could two protocols be utilized in the same LAN. In fact the problem with operably combining these in the same LAN is one of the problems identified in the background of the the present invention. In contrast, claim 1 of the present invention, in part, claims "a first one of the hosts applies a packet of a first redundant router protocol type to the LAN medium and a second one of the hosts applies a packet of a second redundant router protocol ot the LAN medium..." Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Lamberton nor Li, nor any of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose, teach or render obvious the present invention.

Regarding claims 2-9, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 1 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

In the outstanding office action, independent claims 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamberton et al. (US 6,754,220) in view of Chung (US 6,751,225).

Serial No.: 09/815,603  
Examiner: Christopher Grey

Regarding independent claim 10, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular neither Lamberton, Chung, nor the other cited references disclose "A method of routing a plurality of packets using a *plurality of redundant routing protocols...*" (claim 10, emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Lamberton nor Chung, nor any of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose, teach or render obvious the present invention.

Regarding independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular neither Lamberton, Chung, nor the other cited references disclose a "first comparator for comparing a packet address prefix and a first defined value to determine whether the packet is of a *first redundant router protocol type...*" and a "second comparator for comparing the packet address prefix and a second predefined value to determine whether the packet is of a *second redundant router protocol type.*" (claim 18, emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Lamberton nor Chung, nor any of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose, teach or render obvious the present invention.

Regarding claims 11-17, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 10, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 10 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10, Applicants assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.


Regarding claims 19-24, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 18, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 18 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 18, Applicants assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 09/815,603  
Examiner: Christopher Grey

It is believed that the foregoing places the Application in condition for allowance, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-24 as set forth in the Office Action, and full allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL

  
Craig A. Hoersten  
Reg. No. 38,917

Dated: 1-4-05

Alcatel  
Intellectual Property Department  
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2  
Plano, TX 75075  
Phone: (972) 519-5143  
Fax: (972) 477-9328